



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REMARKS ON PROF. CHAMBERLIN'S REVISION OF NORTH AMERICAN
LYCOSIDÆ.

BY THOMAS H. MONTGOMERY, JR.

In Part II of Volume LX of the *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia*, 1908, Prof. R. V. Chamberlin has a memoir entitled a "Revision of North American Spiders of the Family Lycosidæ." This paper is one of decided importance in introducing generic characters based upon the structure of the copulatory organs, and in presenting detailed descriptions of the species. But it is only fair to my antecedent studies on the same group that I should make certain brief criticisms, lest later students might consider Prof. Chamberlin's paper as finally conclusive and authoritative.

In my "Description of North American Araneæ of the Families Lycosidæ and Pisauridæ" (*Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila.*, 1904) I recognized among other valid species twenty that had been described and named by me, whereby I relegated to the synonymy certain few species that I had described as new in two preceding papers. Of these twenty species of which I am the author Prof. Chamberlin regards only two worthy of recognition under the names I had given them, to which treatment I would enter the following partial criticism:

(1) Prof. Chamberlin fails to mention at all two of my species, *Lycosa mccooki* and *Trochosa contestata*.

(2) He places my *Trochosa noctuabunda* as a questionable synonym of his *Allocosa degesta*; but if these species are identical my name should have the priority.

(3) He makes my *Lycosa antelucana* a synonym of *L. apicata* Banks; but my description was published in March, and that of Banks not until June, 1904, hence the name *antelucana* has the priority.

(4) He enters five of my species as synonyms of four of those of Hentz, by resuscitating Hentz's *Lycosa saltatrix*, *fativera*, *milvina* and *funerea*. For each of the first two of these species Hentz gave a four-line description, for *milvina* a five-line, and for *funerea* only three lines, and his figures are lacking in all necessary details. In 1904 I had written: "At the present time it is practically impossible to identify most of the species of Walckenaer, Blackwall, Hentz and some others,

because some of their species are so insufficiently described that a particular description applies equally well to a number of species." Thus Prof. Chamberlin makes, it seems to me, and I take no unusual stand, a grave mistake in resuscitating these and certain other names of Hentz, for the descriptions are practically valueless, the figures in many cases of little more importance, and nothing but uncertainty is to be gained by replacing names based upon detailed descriptions with ones founded upon inadequate diagnoses unsupported by type specimens. Then Prof. Chamberlin places my *Lycosa relucens* and *L. charonoides* as synonyms of *saltatrix* Hentz, though these species of mine differ in important structural characters; and similarly he classes my *Pardosa scita*, that is clearly separable from *P. nigropalpis* Emerton, with the latter as synonyms of *Lycosa milvina* Hentz.

(5) Prof. Chamberlin subjugates my *Pardosa mercurialis* to *lapidiana* Emerton, though these differ in proportion of the legs and in the genital armature. Then he places my *Geolycosa texana* under *Lycosa carolinensis* Hentz, though these exhibit a marked difference in the eyes of the anterior row. Further, he brings my *Lycosa euepigynata*, *L. insopita* and *Trochosa purcelli* all under *Lycosa gulosa* Walckenaer, though Walckenaer in his brief seven-line description states only the color and a few details concerning the eyes, and though I had shown that *Lycosa insopita* "comes closest to *L. euepigynata*, but differs from it in slightly shorter relative length of the legs, in greater relative width of the cephalothorax (in *insopita* less than one-quarter longer than broad, in *euepigynata* decidedly more than one-quarter), in the dark coloration of the venter, and in the structure of the genitalia. It differs also from *L. purcelli*, the epigynum of which is very similar, in the slightly greater relative length of the legs, in greater size, and markedly in the coloration."

(6) Prof. Chamberlin has also withdrawn *Geolycosa mihi* (of which *Scaptocosa* Banks is a synonym) into *Lycosa* Latreille. Yet *Geolycosa* differs markedly from any true *Lycosa* in the size and length of the first legs and in their possession of thick scopulæ.

Had I the time to do so, I believe I could satisfactorily re-establish all of my species that Prof. Chamberlin has tried to disestablish. He has not seen any of the type specimens in my private collection, though I would gladly have given him access to them had I known he was preparing a revision. His revision needs a considerable amount of emendation. What we should all of us do in such matters is not to work apart but in co-operation, and this is almost essential for progress in systematic studies. When the time has come for a taxonomic

revision of any group, those who have contributed most to the subject should bring their collections together in one place, and there they should institute their comparisons conjointly. I stated in my memoir of 1904: "This paper is by no means a comprehensive monograph, but is intended to be a help to the one who comes later with sufficient material at his disposal to make the monograph." The main deficiency in Prof. Chamberlin's revision seems to have been insufficient type material.